



TRW 2666

K.C. Pilecek 1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): Kenneth C. Pilecek
Case: 1
Serial No.: 09/467,240
Filing Date: December 20, 1999
Group: 2666
Examiner: Phuc H. Tran

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signature:

Lisa L. Vulpis

Date: November 21, 2005

Title: Methods and Devices for Providing Links to Experts

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith is the following document relating to the above-identified patent application:

(1) Response to Office Action.

There is no additional fee due in conjunction with the response. In the event of any non-payment or improper payment of a required fee, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or to credit **Avaya Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-1602** as required to correct the error.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph B. Ryan

Date: November 21, 2005

Joseph B. Ryan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 37,922
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-7517



K.C. Pilecek 1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): Kenneth C. Pilecek
Case: 1
Serial No.: 09/467,240
Filing Date: December 20, 1999
Group: 2666
Examiner: Phuc H. Tran

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signature: *David L. Tulpis* Date: November 21, 2005

Title: Methods and Devices for Providing Links to Experts

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The remarks below are submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated August 19, 2005 in the above-identified application.

REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 20, 1999, with claims 1-269. Claims 1, 87 and 176 are the independent claims.

Applicant initially notes that present Office Action is fundamentally deficient on a number of different grounds.

First, the Examiner issued a restriction requirement on May 11, 2005, requiring restriction of claims 1-269 to Group I, comprising claims 1-86, and Group II, comprising claims 87-269. In a response filed June 13, 2005, Applicant elected, with traverse, the claims of Group II, that is, claims 87-269, for continued prosecution on the merits. In the present Office Action, the Examiner provides a detailed rejection of only claims 1-86, and apparently does not address the previous